

**REMARKS**

Entry of this Amendment, reconsideration of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-5, 7, 13-14 and 18, as shown above, remain pending herein. Claims 15 and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 19 has been added, support for which is clearly found in the specification at page 16, line 23 to page 17, line 6.

Claims 1-5, 7, 13-16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goldberg (U.S. 6,122,612) in view of Waibel et al. (U.S. 5,712,957, hereafter "Waibel"). Applicants respectfully traverse for the reasons indicated herein below.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

(h) using the first list as a database to verify one of the hypothesized strings in the second list;

(i) selecting the recognized string in the second list that was verified by the first list. New claim 19 recites the reverse, that the second list is used as a data base to verify an hypothesized string in the first list. Support for both claims is clearly found at least in the specification at page 16, line 23 to page 17, line 6.

In contrast, the combination of Goldberg and Waibel fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Particularly, the combination fails to disclose, suggest, or provide motivation to the artisan to (h) use the first list as a database to verify one of the

hypothesized strings in the second list, and (i) selecting the recognized string in the second list that was verified by the first list.

Accordingly, Applicants again respectfully submit that (1) there is no incentive or motivation found in the references to suggest their combination, and (2) even if a person of ordinary skill in the art were to have combined the alleged teachings of the combination of Goldberg and Waibel at the time of invention, the combination still fails to disclose or suggest using the first list as a database for an hypothesized string in the second list. Nor does the combination of Goldberg and Waibel disclose the reverse that is using the second list as a database for an hypothesized string in the first list.

Furthermore, the motivation for the aforementioned comes from the Applicants claimed invention, and not from anything that an artisan may have gleaned from the combination of Goldberg and Waibel.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration of this ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079



Date: February 19, 2004


By: Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on February 19, 2004.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)



2/19/04  
(Signature and Date)